

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 8, 14 and 20 - 36 are in this application and are presented for consideration. Claims 20 and 26 have been amended, and new claims 35 and 36 have been added.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the personal interview. Applicant has found the personal interview to be very helpful with regard to understanding the rejection. Correspondingly the claims have been amended in accordance with the details discussed during the interview. The claims have also been amended to address the Examiner's objections, incorporate the Examiner's suggestions and to place the application in better form. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful reading of this application, for pointing out discrepancies, for providing suggestions, and indicating allowable subject matter.

In particular the independent claims have been amended to set forth a drive unit mounted on each unit frame, where the drive unit generates the cutting forces for moving a knife against a cutting strip. The unit frame is set forth in the claims as absorbing these cutting forces between the knife and the cutting strip.

The independent claims have been rejected as being anticipated by Sarring '336. As discussed during the interview, Sarring does not disclose a drive unit mounted on a unit frame, where the unit frame absorbs the cutting forces. Instead the cutting forces in 332 are provided by a motor 1516 as shown in figure 3. This motor 1516 powers many, if not all, of the different moving elements in the entire book trimmer of Sarring. There is no unit frame for each cutting station in Sarring with its own motor, and where the unit frame absorbs the cutting forces generated by that motor. This is especially true with regard to first and second cutting stations

that are movably mounted on a common support frame. The independent claims 20 and 26 therefore cannot be anticipated by Sarring.

Claim 20 has also been amended to set forth that the cutting strip and the knife are arranged on the unit frame to perform a squeeze cut. In Sarring, a shearing cut is performed. As described during the interview, shearing cuts are in practice limited to cutting relatively small stacks. Once the stacks become too tall, the quality of the cut is degraded because the twisting turning forces both on the paper and in the connection between the knife blades, becomes unacceptable. Furthermore, the shearing cut of Sarring has the advantage that the endpoint of the knives do not have to stop at a precise location. The knives in Sarring are meant to overlap and therefore any elasticities in Sarring can be compensated by having a greater overlap. This is not possible in a squeeze cut where an overshoot or over travel of a knife against a cutting strip will leave an indentation in the cutting strip. This indentation may prevent the bottom sheet in future stacks from being properly cut. Therefore it would not be obvious to modify Sarring to cause the present invention to be obvious.

New claims 35 and 36 have been added to set forth that the pressing elements are in the form of shutters. As discussed during the interview, and as shown in figure 3, the shutters are the preferably roller type shutters, such as the shutters used in rolling cabinet doors and rolltop desks. In the original German version of the priority document the German word "jalousieartige" is used which often refers to the rolling exterior window shutters commonly used in Germany. Applicant acknowledges that these new claims are drawn to a nonelected species. Upon allowance of a linking claim, applicant respectfully requests that these withdrawn

claims be rejoined.

Applicant again thanks the Examiner for the personal interview and for indicating allowable subject matter. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which would further favorable prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's representative by telephone to discuss possible changes.

At this time applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, and based on the above amendments and remarks, respectfully solicits allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted
for Applicant,



By: _____
Theobald Dengler
Registration No. 34,575
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

TD:tf

Attached: Petition for Two Month Extension of Time
70418RCE-24

DATED: December 19, 2007
BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-9227
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-0410.